



2645

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of: Joseph R. Szarka, et al.)
For: Equipment Lockout) Confirmation No. 9788
System) Art Unit: 2645
Serial No.: 09/942,800) Examiner: Ming Chow
Filed: August 30, 2001)

TRANSMITTAL LETTER

October 24, 2005

Commissioner For Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Enclosed is an Amendment/Response to the Office Action which was mailed on July 27, 2005 and a postcard receipt addressed to Applicants' attorney. Please file the Amendment/Response, mark the postcard with the date of receipt and return it to the undersigned attorney. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink.

David J. Hill
Attorney for Applicants
(Registration No. 28427)
Chambliss, Bahner & Stophel, P.C.
1000 Tallan Building
Two Union Square
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402-2500
423/756-3000

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with postage prepaid in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, on October 24, 2005.

A handwritten signature in black ink.

Donna Guy
Date of Signature: October 24, 2005



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of: Joseph R. Szarka, et al.) Confirmation No. 9788
For: Equipment Lockout)
System) Art Unit: 2645
)
Serial No.: 09/942,800) Examiner: Ming Chow
)
Filed: August 30, 2001)

AMENDMENT/RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

October 24, 2005

Commissioner For Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on July 27, 2005. Claims 1-8 are pending in this application. Of these, claims 1 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite in their use of the term "substantially". Claims 1, 7 and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over a combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,025,175 of Dubois and U.S. Patent No. 6,778,097 of Kajita et al. Objection has been raised to claims 2-5 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claim 6 has been allowed.

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 7 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which they regard as their invention. In addition, Applicants offer the following remarks to address the §103 rejection of their claims and respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of such amendments and remarks.